

78 13

693.d/13

A
Recantation-Sermon
AGAINST
The ERRORS of
P O P E R Y,
Particularly
Transubstantiation.

Preach'd At
St. *MARTIN's* in *OXFORD*,
Sept. 20th, 1713.

Before the Right Rev^d Father in GOD,
W I L L I A M,
Lord Bishop of *Oxford*,

And the Right Worshipful the MAYOR,
ALDERMEN, ASSISTANTS
and BAILIFFS of that City.

By *WILLIAM ATLMER*, lately Professor
of Divinity in the *Roman* Church.

Publish'd at the Desire of His Lordship,
And the said Gentlemen.

O X F O R D:

Printed by *L. Lichfield*, for *Anth. Peisley*, and are to be Sold
by *J. Knapton*, *H. Clements*, *W. Taylor* and *J. Morphew*,
Bookfellers in *LONDON*, MDCCXIII.

Price Six Pence.

Imprimatur,

BERN. GARDINER,

Vice-Canc. Oxon.

Sept. 30. 1713.

Ad 16^{um} Concilium DANIEL. WEBB,
Armig. MAJOR. Civitat. Oxon.
tent. in Guildhall, ejusd. Civitat.
25. die Sept. *An. Dom.* 1713.

AT this Council Mr. *James Hall*,
and Mr. *William Chettle*, are
Desired to Wait on the Rev^d Mr.
William Aylmer, and acquaint Him,
That it is the Unanimous Request
of this Chamber, that He Print the
excellent Sermon by Him Preach'd
before the City of *Oxford* the 20th
Instant.

Sam. Thurstan,

Com. Cler. Civitat. pradiet.

2 PETER II. I.

There shall be False Teachers among you, who shall privily bring in damnable Heresies.

THERE is nothing that more effectually puts Men upon fencing and guarding against any Danger, than the prospect or timely notice thereof. 'Tis then that Self-preservation, implanted in every Breast, more particularly exerts it self, and rouzes Men up to all possible Vigilance and Precaution. The General who apprehends the Stratagems of a hovering Enemy, immediately secures the Avenues, doubles his Guard, takes an Alarm upon the least Motion, and stands every Moment in a ready posture of Defence. Our care and circumspection in the grand concern of Salvation, when Religion is in Danger, and Eternity lies at Stake, should, beyond all dispute, be incomparably greater; and therefore we find our Apostle so solicitous to engage Christians in this their greatest Duty and Interest. 'Tis from these Views that he employs the most part of this Epistle in forewarning Christians of the danger of Seduction, and arming them against *False Teachers*. Having in the first Chapter en-
v. 16, 17, 18.

- deavour'd to animate their *Faith*, to encourage their *Hope*, and inflame their *Charity*,
v. 4, 5, &c. he now proceeds to settle and secure them in the possession of these essential Virtues of Christianity, to screen those tender Plants from the malignant Blasts of Error and Heresy. In order to this he charges them to keep a steady Eye on the Holy Scriptures, as on a *light which shining in the dark*, would safely direct them in their way to Heaven. And for fear they should be misled by pretending Guides, for fear they should be surpriz'd and impos'd upon by *False Teachers*, he gives them a timely caution against such Religious Cheats. He foretells their Coming, describes their Character, and discovers their Artifices. He points out the conceited *Scepticks* and *Free-thinkers*; paints to the Life the *Self-will'd Fanaticks*, who *despise Government*, and *speak ill of Dignities*; and gives the distinguishing marks of many other Religious Impostors. As in the *Jewish Church* there arose many *False Prophets*, so says he, you must expect that *False Teachers* will start up among you Christians, and *privily bring in damnable Heresies*.
Chap. 1. v. 19.
Ch. 3. v. 3.
Ch. 2. v. 10.
Ch. 2. v. 1.

This Prediction contain'd in the Words of my Text, we find by sad Experience verified in these latter Ages, as well as in the early Times of Christianity. And 'tis a melancholy Prospect to observe what a Litter of Monstrous Sects has crept into the World, and still crawls about, to the disgrace of Religion, and the dishonour of Human Reason. But who would ever suspect to meet with
Ch. of Rome. False Teachers in that very Church which
 so

to confi
 fallibili
 this Ch
 rious T
 found g
 That sh
 all the
 her Chi
 yet this
 mean th
 nable H
 in the F
 Religio
 our Fan
 and un
 of her
 learn'd
 the ar
 had so
 that C
 Center
 the Go
 Errors
 chang
 Truth,
 the gr
 sembli
 Opera
 Legen
 the O
 Bible
 useles

* Ap
 ture nu
 Italy.

A Recantation-Sermon.

5

So confidently claims the Prerogative of Infallibility? Who could ever imagin, that this Church which proudly assumes the Glorious Title of Christ's only Spouse, should be found guilty of the most flagrant Disloyalty? That she, who stiles her self the *Mother of all the Faithful*, should unnaturally poison her Children with pestilent Doctrines? And yet this very Church (I need not tell you I mean the *Romish*) has privily introduc'd damnable Heresies, and at last openly spawn'd them in the Face of the whole World. That Holy Religion, which *the Author and Finisher of our Faith* brought down from Heaven pure and undefiled, she, by the fatal Negligence of her Pastors, the Whimlies of the Half-learn'd, the Stupidity of her People, and the artful Contrivance of Designing Men, had so corrupted, defac'd and metamorphos'd, that Christianity was to seek in the very Center of Christendom. The Splendor of the Gospel strangely Eclips'd by the darkest Errors and Superstition. 'Tis she that has chang'd the *Worship of GOD in Spirit and Truth*, into Pomp and Pageantry, and made the grave Christian Sacrifice too much resembling an antick Scene, and a phantastical Opera. * 'Tis she that has obtruded Fabulous Legends, or, at best, Human Compositions, for the Oracles of Heaven, and lock'd up the Bible from the Bulk of Christians as an uselefs, nay dangerous Book. Christians are

Conc. Florent.
Lateran. Sub.
Innocent XI.
anno 1215.

In the Council
of Trent.

Mast and
Pompous Pro-
cessions.

* Apocryphal Books defined to be Scripture. The Scripture not permitted in the Vulgar Language in Spain and Italy.

now

*In the Index
of Prohibited
Books.*

*Seruen Sacra-
ments.*

*Transubstantia-
tion.*

Pilgrimages.

*Invocation of
Saints and An-
gels.*

*Indulgences in
Leo the Tenth's
time.*

Purgatory.

*Supremacy and
deposing Power.*

now no more suffer'd to consult their Father's Testament; and now, it seems, 'tis neither safe nor convenient to read our Saviour's own Sermons, nor any of the Apostles Instructions. 'Tis this Church which has coin'd new Sacraments without Matter or Form, and dress'd up the true with idle Fopperies, and whimsical Ceremonies. A small Wafer, at first over-respected, is now grown up to an invisible and unaccountable Miracle, and solemnly ador'd as a Mystery of Mysteries, a Saviour, a God. Rambling to *Rome*, or *Jerusalem*, was one while almost esteem'd half-way to Heaven, and too many persuaded themselves that they could arrive there sooner, by invoking the Creature ten times oftner than the Creator. Pardons for a long time were scandalously expos'd to Sale, while the description of an unseen Dungeon, next Door to Hell, frightened People out of their Wits and their Money. *The Servant of the Servants of GOD* not only Lorded it over his Equals, but hector'd and vilified Crown'd Heads, and the *Vatican* Thunder overturning Thrones, scar'd Kings and Emperors out of their Dominions. Her Schoolmen's Metaphysical Fancies have been minted into Articles of Faith*, and some Persons voted to be Triumphant in Heaven, who probably never Liv'd upon Earth. * There was a time too when † Foxes and Firebrands were employ'd to purge the Corn;

* *In the Council of Trent. Canonizations.* * 11000 Virgins, St. Christopher, St. Catharine, Longinus, &c. † *The Crusado against the Albigeois.*

and

A Recantation-Sermon.

7

and *Dominicks* Canoniz'd, who preach'd up and abett'd Murther. Not to mention how within our own Memory, Tortures and Prisons, Dragoons and Gallies have been made use of to propagate Religion. Most Glorious Instruments to convert Souls, and convince the Understanding!

The Dragoon Mission in Languedoc, 1685, 6, -7.

Such was the state of Popery, immediately before the happy Reformation, and tho' since that, some few of their Abuses have been corrected; tho' that Religion, as varnisht by the *French Expositor* and *English Representer*, appear not so deform'd, yet if we barely consider it as deliver'd in Pope *Pius's* new Edition of Faith, we shall find it still Black enough. If we gather it from their publick Offices, authoriz'd Devotions, and general Practice, we shall find it of a deeper Dye. The old Spirit still remains. The King-killing Doctrin as much countenanced and encouraged at *Rome* as ever. We still find People obliged to Obey without Reason, to Believe against Sense, and to Pray without Understanding.

The Bishop of Meaux. Pius the IVth's Formulary, an. 1564.

Nuns read the Psalms, Lessons, and Collects, in Latin.

But lest I should run into wild Declamation, I shall out of all these erroneous Doctrines of Popery, single out One Particular for the subject of my present Discourse, Namely, *Transubstantiation*. This Tenet is One of the main Hinges of that Church, the favorite Doctrin of Her Divines, and a principal Article of our Test. This being prov'd to be a senseless Innovation, and a pernicious Error, our Reformation is justified, our Religion confirm'd, and our Laws defended.

Where-

Wherefore, I shall First endeavour to shew That the Popish Doctrin of *Transubstantiation* is contrary to Scripture, and so *Heretical*: Incidentally observing its Repugnance to Sense and Reason. Secondly, That 'tis contrary to primitive Antiquity, and therefore an Innovation *privily brought in*; and in the Last place, briefly infer and prove it *Damnable*.

Council of Trent
Sess. 13. cap. 4.
And Pope Pius
the IVth's For-
mulary.

Ibid. cap. c. 5.

The Jesuits, and
Pope Clem. XI.
in his last Bull
against the Jan-
senists, publish'd
about 8 Years
ago.

By *Transubstantiation* the Roman Church means that in the Holy Eucharist, *The whole substance of Bread is by Consecration destroy'd and chang'd into the true Body of Jesus Christ, and in like manner the substance of Wine entirely destroy'd and converted into His precious Blood*: So that the whole Body, Soul and Divinity of our Saviour, are truly, properly, and physically present, and immediately contain'd under the forms of Bread and Wine, in Million of Altars at the same time, as truly as in Heaven it self, and that all Christians are obliged to believe this, and pay the highest Adoration to the Sacrament.

I do not design to quarrel with the Term *Transubstantiation*, (tho' I might justly do it against these new Pretenders to a kind of *Grammatical Infallibility*, and easily shew how absurd and ridiculous the Word is, importing according to their explication, a meer *Translocation*, rather than a *substantial Conversion*) but proceed to prove my first Position.

First then, If *plain, positive, repeated* words of Scripture, deliver'd by an infallible Interpreter of Christ's own Words, in a most solemn and intelligible Manner, be sufficient to settle and ascertain any Point of Doctrin,

we

we shall find the present Controversy decided ready to our Hands: For St. Paul professedly treating of this Subject, positively and plainly affirms, that We Christians *all partake of* 1 Cor. c.X.v.17. *Bread in the Holy Communion.* And in the next Chapter repeats the same Expression no less than Thrice. *As often, says He, as ye* Chap.XI. v.26, 27, 28. *eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord's Death until He come. Whosoever shall eat this Bread and drink this Cup of the Lord unworthily, &c. Let a Man examine himself, and so let Him eat of that Bread and drink of that Cup.* Now 'tis exceeding evident, that these words cannot be true, unless the substance of Bread really remain. For 'tis self-manifest, that figure and whiteness, fluidity and colour, which according to the *Romanists* only remain, are no more Bread and Wine, than redness is Blood, or coldness Water: And if the Bread be reduc'd to nothing, consequently it is no more Bread than before it began to exist: Unless our Adversaries can find out a particular secret to make it remain Bread and not Bread at the same time. To fancy with *Bellarmin*, that the Apostle calls the consecrated Element Tom. 2. lib. 2. de Sacrament. *Bread, because it retains the external Form thereof,* is to offer a Dream instead of a Solution. Such a Cob-web Distinction not only visibly begs the Question, but clashes with the most certain Rules of interpreting Holy Scripture. If because the Apostle, by an easy and familiar Figure, once calls the Sacrament *the Body of our Lord*, it be allow'd to strain and torture Five or Six plain Assertions to an Unnatural and Unintelligible

B

Sense;

Sense; if one seemingly obscure Expression may be brought to illustrate the most clear and most distinct Texts, then farewell the whole Bible, the sacred Oracles of GOD will be made as perplext as those of *Delphi*, and a little Scholastick *Legerdemain* may distinguish away all Sense and Divinity. Nay, allowing this strange Method of Expounding, one may with equal reason conclude, that all the Communicants in the World are substantially changed into Bread, and then transform'd into our Saviour's Body, because *St. Paul* says, that Christians are *one Bread and*

1 Cor. 10. 17.

one Body.
Secondly, In the whole Tenour of *St. Paul's* Discourse there's nothing that favours such a senseless Exposition as *Bellarmin* gives. We find no hint of any physical Change, not a Syllable relating to the Destruction of the Elements: Not one Word of Adoration; no mention at all of complicated Mysteries and Miracles, such as our Adversaries maintain: Yet surely one might suppose, that the Apostle would never have omitted such essential Points, when he had the fairest Occasion, and all the reason in the World to take Notice of them. The very Scope of this part of his Epistle, was to redress those Abuses which had crept into the Church of *Corinth*, in celebrating the Sacrament; One whereof was their joyning this holy Rite with their common Meals. How natural was it for a Zealous Apostle to have told them, that the Mystery which they prophaned, was that individual Body of our Saviour which was Crucified for them. That Christ was there

A Recantation-Sermon.

II

as Corporally present as in Heaven: That they held him in their very Hands, and should kneel down, prostrate and adore Him. These are Topicks which every common Preacher in the *Roman Church* makes use of, to deter Persons from Communicating Unworthily. Certainly such Admonitions would have created the highest Veneration, and more effectually prevented all Irregularities. But *St. Paul* was a Stranger to *Transubstantiation*. He knew nothing of a *crude, carnal Presence*: And therefore we find his Instructions are quite of another strain. He only reminds them of the end of the Institution of this Sacrament: Tells them, that Christ appointed it as a Memorial of his Passion, and that by treating this Bread prophanely, they incur'd *Damnation, not discerning*, or not discriminating [*ὁ δὲ διακρίνων*] a Sacrament from their usual Repast.

1 Cor. X. 17.

Thirdly, The words of the Institution of this Holy Sacrament, afford us another equally clear and convincing Proof against *Transubstantiation*. The Evangelists tell us, that our Blessed Saviour at his last Supper, took Bread, blessed it, brake it, and gave it to his Disciples and said, take, eat, this is my Body; and then the Cup, saying, drink ye all of this, for this is the Blood of the New Testament which is shed for many, for the remission of Sins; Do this in remembrance of Me. Now that which Jesus Christ gave his Apostles, was the same which immediately before he held in his sacred Hands, and that the Evangelists assure us was Bread. This Assertion is exceeding plain from the very Nature of

Matth. XXVI.
v. 26, 27.

the Demonstrative Pronoun *This*. Such words denote and point out a *particular, present, sensible* Object, (when applied to Bodies) so the meaning of the Sentence must be, *this Bread is my Body*; whence by evident Deduction it follows, that the Bread remains substantially Unchang'd. And since our Saviour calls the *Bread his Body*; the word *Body* must of necessity be understood in a mystical Sense. For as *Bellarmin* truly, tho' with an impious Comparison, observes, *Bread can no more be the Natural Body of Christ in a literal and proper Sense, than God can be Belial*. It follows then, that Bread can no otherwise be Christ's Body, than in a Figurative and Sacramental Signification.

Fourthly, This Interpretation will yet appear more evidently true, if possible, from our Saviour's words spoken in delivering the Holy Cup. The Evangelists relate, that before he reacht it to his Disciples, *He said, drink ye all of this*. In which Sentence, the word *This*, most clearly and distinctly signified Wine: For according to the Confession of the *Romanists*, when those words were pronounc'd, there was no Change made at that time, (The suppos'd Conversion being attributed to the words of Consecration, which were not then pronounc'd.) So that our Blessed Saviour's Words in effect run thus, *Drink ye all of this Wine, Drink ye of what is now in the Cup*. I need not observe to You, how visibly this overthrows the whole Structure of *Transubstantiation*.

Fifthly, For a farther Confirmation, we may observe, that Christ did not barely say,

this

Matth. 26. 27.
Mark 14. 23.

A Recantation-Sermon.

13

this is my Body, but this is my Body *broken*, this is my Blood *Shed* for You. These words being spoken when his Body was not yet Crucified, nor his Holy Blood Shed, 'tis self-evident, that these Expressions can't be taken in a strict literal Sense; for so his Body must have been broken and entire; his Blood Shed, and not yet Shed at the same time, which is a manifest Contradiction. Our Adversaries have been sensible of this Argument, and therefore One of their celebrated Authors, says, *It seems as if the Romish Church had designedly omitted in the form of Consecration these words, Which is broken, lest they should give occasion absurdly to imagine, that Christ's Body is there really broken.* Give me leave occasionally to add this Observation, That in consecrating the Cup, they have foisted in two words of their own Forging, Namely, *Mysterium Fidei*; and yet have the strange Confidence to declare, * that Jesus Christ said these Words, tho' not One Evangelist, no Apostle, no Primitive Writer whatsoever, ever mention'd a Syllable of this matter.

But to pursue my Subject, The foresaid Words, *this is my Body*, must undoubtedly be interpreted in a symbolical Sense, unless we suppose, against all Reason, Example and Authority, that our Blessed Saviour used the word *This*, in a sense absolutely Foreign, nay directly Contrary, to the current Usage of all Mankind; and this without giving any hint, or any ways intimating this unheard, unusual and unnatural Acceptation. For I believe 'tis impossible to produce One single Instance

1 Cor. XI. 24.
Matth. XXVI.
23. —

Jansen. Com.
in 26. Matth.

After these words, *Novi & æterni Testam. follow Mysterium Fidei*, in the Mass-Book.

* In the Council of Trent 'tis defined, that there is no Error in the Canon of the Mass.

stance in any Author whatsoever, where the Demonstrative Pronoun *This*, is ever us'd to express a Proper, Physical and Substantial Change of One Body into another, or to signify the real Presence of any Body just that Moment after the Pronunciation thereof. On the contrary, all Writers, Sacred or Profane, have constantly used Demonstrative Pronouns, to convey a distinct Idea to the Mind, the Moment they are spoken, without suspending the signification till the end of the Sentence.

Maldonate, in
the Word, Edite.
Tom. 1. de Sa-
crament.

Suarez, in ly
Frangitur.

Salmeron, in
voce Calix.

Jansen, in E-
vangel.

Bellarmin, and
all other Rom.
Divines.

V.G Effunditur,
Frangitur, a-
pud Autores
citatos.

Job. XV. 1.

Besides, the *Roman* Divines generally grant, that in the whole Series of the Institution, there are Five or Six Expressions which cannot bear a literal Sense, and must necessarily be taken metaphorically. If so, what colour of reason can there be why these Words, *this is my Body*, may not be equally understood in a Symbolical Sense? Why must there needs be just Six Figures, and no more? Why may not One Figure be used in a Testament as well as another? To this the great Champion of their cause is pleas'd to reply, That those Figures which they allow, are *vulgar and obvious*. But (not to take notice how untrue this Answer is in regard of some of their Figures) is not the figurative Expression, which we maintain in the words of Institution, equally easy and obvious in the Scripture Language? How often do we find the Sign of a thing call'd by the Name of the thing signified? Does not Christ call himself *a Vine, the Door*, and the like? Yet what Man in his Wits, did ever interpret these words in a literal Sense? And why must these

Words

Words,
such a
and Im
Aga
ution
sition.
said of
Passover
in a lit
anniver
known
would
meanin
Nay, th
in any
mystica
to what
of him.
Rememb
and tha
present,
a past E
that wh
and hov
any real
How co
sitting a
himself
prehend
swallow
the sam
Could f
enter in
Would
nature,
recovery

A Recantation-Sermon.

15

Words, *this is my Body*, be understood in such a Sense as is equally Absurd, Ridiculous and Impossible?

Again, The Circumstances of the Institution of this Sacrament confirm our Exposition. Our Blessed Saviour had just before said of the Paschal Lamb, *this is the Lord's Passover*, tho' the Lamb were not the *Passover* in a literal Sense, but only the Antitype, or Anniversary Memorial of the Passover. This known Expression, and familiar Figure, would naturally let the Apostles into the meaning of those Words, *this is my Body*. Nay, they could not possibly understand them in any other than in a representative and mystical Sense. For our Saviour bid them do what he himself then did, *in remembrance* Luke 22. 19. of him. They could not be ignorant, that Remembrance refers to an absent Object; and that the Memorial of a thing actually present, is as absurd as an actual Prophecy of a past Event. All their Senses told them, that what they receiv'd was Bread and Wine, and how could they gather or suspect that any real Change was made in the Elements? How could they imagin, that Jesus Christ sitting at the Table with them, gave away himself from himself? How could they apprehend that He eat his own Body; that He swallow'd that very Blood, which was at the same time circulating in his Veins? Could such out-of-the-way Fancies ever enter into illiterate and unprepared Minds? Would not the very first Thought of this nature, have shockt and startled them past all recovery? Would they not have started a-
bundance

bundance of Questions about such an unintelligible Mystery, as we find they did upon other less occasions? And how can we account for their silence, but that they understood the words, *Body and Blood*, in a like sense as the word *Passover*. Nay, I do not see how we can feign, that the Apostles believ'd that Liquor which they receiv'd, to be the real Blood of their living Master, when speaking thereof he plainly told them, that he intended to drink no more of the fruit of the Vine*. Could they imagin, that by the Fruit of the Vine, our Saviour meant his real Blood? Or, as some of our Adversaries will have it, idle and pendulous Accidents, vailing and containing not only his whole mass of Blood, but his sacred Body too in the same Cup, as our Adversaries teach. These are such wild Conceits, so remote from all common Understandings, that no Man, without violence to his Reason, can ever suppose, that the Apostles should dream of such Chimeras.

But, since our Adversaries will, in spite of all Sense and Reason, needs interpret these words, *this is my Body*, in a literal Sense, let us suppose this Sense for once, and see how it will mend their Cause. If then these words, *this is my Body*, be taken in a proper Sense, what will unavoidably follow? What

* The Fathers understand this of the Eucharistical Cup. Chrysostom. in locum, homil. 82. Genad. de Dogmat. Ecclesiast. Cypr. Ep. 63. Epiphani. contra Encratitas. Synod. Trullana, c. 32. Origen. Euthym. Bed. -- Ex Pontific. Inn. 3. de Off. Missæ, lib. 4. Estius, in 4. dist. 11. Janseu. Concord. p. 914. Salmer. tom. 9. c. 14. Vasq. tom. c. 4. d. 196.

A
only th
that in
Body is
natural
Then n
visible,
Then n
extende
Senses
peal to
kind,
natural
not imp
paralle
Body u
Sepulch
ever d
his Bo
accomp
and oth
human
faries

Her
Appari
frequ
which
credul
and wi
popula
Power
it is no
should
and Bl

* See
Cesar, S
tipraten

only this, that then the *Romanists* must grant, that in the Holy Eucharist Christ's sacred Body is contain'd, as attended with all its natural Dimensions, Properties and Qualities. Then must they grant, that Christ is there *visible, palpable, in due proportion and stature*. Then must they grant, that his Body is there extended, organiz'd, and exercising all his Senses and vital Faculties. For I dare appeal to the common Judgment of all Mankind, whether a human living Body, in the *natural, proper and literal* signification, does not import all this. Nay, 'tis evident from parallel Expressions. When we say *Christ's Body was nail'd to the Cross, was laid in the Sepulchre, or ascended into Heaven*, no Man ever did, or ever could understand this of his Body divested of all its Accidents, but accompanied with extension, colour, figure, and other modes or attributes annext to a human Body. So wisely have our Adversaries furnisht Weapons against themselves.

Here the *Romanists*, instead of Visions, Apparitions, and ridiculous Miracles *, so frequently muster'd up in darker times, which then easily impos'd on ignorant and credulous People, do now change their note, and with a train of pompous Eloquence, and popular Argument, appeal to the absolute Power of the Almighty. They alledge, that it is no more difficult to conceive, how God should change Bread and Wine into his Body and Blood, than with one Omnipotent *Fiat*

* See some of these fine Miracles in *Walsingham, an. 1218. Caesar, Spec. Exemplor. Sedulius's Life of S. Ant. Tho. Cantipratensis.*

Create the Universe. That Faith is the great Tribute of our Understandings; that Reason must submit to Revelation. That divine Mysteries are the proper Subject of our admiration, belief and veneration, no more to be scann'd by our finite Understandings, than the vast Globe of the World can be graspt by our narrow Span, or the main Ocean measured with a Shell. This, say they, is a sufficient motive for any Christian to acquiesce, to captivate his Understanding, obey the Church and Believe.

Now, if we strip this Rhetorick of all its false Colours, we shall presently discover nothing but an empty flourish. A specious Sophism, tending to perswade People to put out their Eyes, under pretence of making them more clear-sighted. No Christian, say they, should dispute against Revelation. This we all grant, and freely acknowledge, that Revelation must over-rule the most specious and most plausible Arguments. Revelation justly claims the highest degree of Assent, and must silence all opposition. In obedience to this we must sacrifice all Probabilities and apparent Demonstrations. But where is *Transubstantiation* reveal'd? For we must first be satisfied, that such a particular Doctrine is really reveal'd, before we can be obliged to believe it. And it belongs to Reason to enquire, inform, judge and decide, whether a pretended Mystery be clearly reveal'd, or no. All the Pretence of Revelation, or Decision of a particular Church, can never prevail against immediate Intuition, or the evident Deductions of true Reason.

Reason. Such we have in the present Controversy. For the same numerical Body to be fetcht down from Heaven in an instant, yet at the same moment to remain in Heaven, or to be produc'd anew, tho' never destroy'd; [When all Production as essentially presupposes Non-existence, as Destruction presupposes Pre-existence] to remain an entire Body, and yet be broken into Wholes: To consist of real Parts, and yet retain no extension, to be crouded into an indivisible Space, and still continue an organiz'd Body. To acquire the essential Properties of a Spirit, yet notwithstanding to be in reality no more a Spirit, than the Sun: To be truly made of Bread and Wine, tho' not one single Atome of these substances be any constituent part thereof. In fine, for the same individual Body to be above and below, greater and lesser, present and absent from itself, at the very same instant; these, and a Hundred more Consequences, either acknowledged, or evidently flowing from the Doctrine of Carnal Presence and *Transubstantiation*, are such palpable Absurdities, such inconsistent Notions, such glaring Contradictions, as no Man, who fairly examines his own Idea's, and has not prostituted his Reason to implicate Faith, and enslaved his Judgment to an imaginary Infallibility, can possibly cheat himself into a Belief of. Under colour of Revelation, to persuade Men to believe against the plain Testimonies of Sense and Reason, is in effect to overthrow all Religion. Such Tenets overturn all our natural Notions, Shake the first Principles, and Sap the Foundation of all Belief.

*Vide Tertull. de
Anima, c. 7.*

Luke 24. 39.

*Seff. 13. c. 4.
Innocent 3. cap.
firmiter, de sum-
ma Trinitate, in
the Canon Law
of Gregory IX.*

lief. If the Senses of all Mankind may *perpetually, permanently and universally* deceive them, then they can be sure of nothing. What certainty could the Apostles have of Christ's Existence, Crucifixion, or Resurrection? How weak had our Saviour's Argument prov'd, when to induce his staggering Disciples to believe, that he was truly Risen, that what they saw was not a Phantom, but a real Body, he appeal'd to their Senses; *Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself. Handle and see Me, for a Spirit has not flesh and bones as you see me have.* This, according to the new *Romish* Philosophy, had evinced just nothing at all. So true is that ancient Maxim, *Grant one Absurdity and a Thousand follow.*

Let us now turn this very Argument against the *Romanists*, and see how consistent they are with themselves. Let us ask them Why they so stiffly maintain the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*? Is it not because they read these Words, *this is my Body*, in the Gospel, or the definition of the *Council of Trent*, or *Pope Innocent's* Decree? But if their Senses may deceive them, What certainty have they that any such Words are there? If their Eyes tell them so, the same Senses with their Feeling, Taste and Smell, with equal Evidence assure them, that Bread and Wine remain after Consecration. Will they pretend a Revelation for their assurance in one case, and a Revelation that they are not deluded in the other? Neither will this pitiful Shift avail them. For what certainty can they have of any Revelation, since that

can-

cannot be deliver'd but by the Senses, and these, according to their own Concession, are fallible? Besides, to believe after this manner, would be to believe GOD in contradiction to himself. For here one must believe this very Revelation upon the Evidence of Sense, when at the same time the same Revelation assures, that one must not rely upon Sense. Thus all their fluttering serves only to entangle them the more.

But why should I dwell any longer on this matter, when our Adversaries grant almost as much as we need. The most acute of all the Schoolmen, with a numerous Sect of Divines, his followers, with many other eminent Writers, ingenuously confess, that their Doctrine can't be prov'd out of Scripture. This is to give up the Cause. For if an Article of Faith cannot be found in the only Rule of Faith, whence will they derive it? Have they any new Revelations? This they don't pretend to. How then dare they define and obtrude as a reveal'd Doctrine, that which they can't tell whether GOD has reveal'd or not. Of what Tyranny over Conscience, Schism and Uncharitableness, are they guilty, who curse, damn, and sentence to Hell, whole National Churches, because they don't see in the Scriptures what they themselves cannot find there. And brand them with the odious Name of Heretics, because they can't believe against the self-evident Dictates of Sense and Reason. Their usual Pretence of a *Traditive Exposition* in favour of this Doctrine, is a sorry Evasion, trump't up on purpose to serve a turn;
just

Scot. in 4. d. 11.
q. 13. Durand.
Biel. in Can.
Missa. Ockam,
in 4. d. 11. q.
6. Cardinal de
Aliaco, ibid.
Rossens. contra
Luther. Cajetan
in 3 part. Thom.
q. 73. art. 1.
Canus, Episc.
Canar. Alphons.
a Castro.

just like the Refuge of Ignorant Philosophers, who to decline a Difficulty, fly to the silly shift of an occult Quality. This will appear in my Second Point, namely, that *Transubstantiation* is repugnant to Primitive Antiquity.

Altho' our Church justly professes to admit of no other Rule of her Faith than the Holy Scriptures : Yet she never declines the trial of her Doctrines by the Authority of the Primitive Fathers. She pays a due Veneration to those Orthodox Writers, without obliging her self blindly to receive all their Opinions. And since the *Romanists*, in the present Controversy pretend, that Antiquity stands on their side, let us examine their Plea, and we shall find their Confidence as great, as their Reason little.

And first we may observe, that in this Point we have the greatest Presumptions imaginable, that the Primitive Christians were unacquainted with this Doctrine. The *Jews* and *Gentiles*, whose implacable Malice never spared the poor Christians, never slipt any opportunity of exposing and ridiculing their Mysteries, have not made so much as one Objection relating to this Sacrament. There were great numbers of Apostates in every Age, some of them very Learned Men, (such as *Porphyrius*, *Quintus*, *Phygelus*, and several others) and can we imagin that all would have been silent, and in excuse for their Desertion, not have alledg'd those prodigious Absurdities, which, if I may so phrase it, stare every thinking Person in the Face? Would not *Julian*, that infamous Emperor, who

*Ensch. lib. 4.
Eccles. Histor.*

who was educated an Ecclesiastick, perfectly knew the Christian Doctrine, and rak'd up all the Dirt he could to fling at its Professors, have lain hold on this occasion to deride, triumph, and insult over them? He knew how often the Christians had upbraided the Pagans, with worshipping a God who devour'd his own Children, and would have retorted the Objection, and prov'd the Christians guilty of greater Folly, Stupidity and Impiety, in Eating that very God whom they Ador'd. So we find the *Arabian* Philosopher did, when *Transubstantiation* first peept abroad. *Quandoquidem Christiani comedant quod adorant, sit Anima mea cum Philosophis.* Instead of this we find this inveterate Enemy only objects, that Christians had no Sacrifices. This the Christian Apologists never denied; but answer'd, that a *pure Heart* was the *Christians Altar*. Their Prayers, Praises, with the Oblation of their Souls and Bodies to GOD, their only and best of Sacrifices. Thus answers *Tertullian*: Thus *Clement Alexandrinus*, *Athenagoras*, *Minutius Felix*, *Origen*, and others. Let no Man reply, that the Argument is merely Negative: For all things consider'd, 'tis a manifest Sign, and equivalent to Demonstration, that the *Popish Mass* and *Transubstantiation*, were then absolutely unknown to both Christians, Jews and Gentiles.

Secondly, We may observe, that the Ancient Fathers universally maintain, that Multipresence is the sole Prerogative of the Infinite Deity. In their Disputations against the *Arians* and *Macedonians*, they constantly maintain, that the Holy Ghost must be God, be-

In the 11th
Age.

*Averrhoes apud
Card. Perron,
de Euch. cap. 29.*

*Tertull. c. 30.
Apologet. Athe-
nagor. Legat.
pro Christianis.
Origen. contra
Cels. Minut. Fe-
lix in Octavio.
Cyrill. Alexand.
lib. 10. contra
Julianum.*

because he is every where present; and that no pure Creature, not the very Seraphims, much less a Human Body, can be in many Places at once. These Positions are absolutely inconsistent with the belief of *Transubstantiation*.

Thirdly, We find several Practices of those times irreconcilable with the belief of this Doctrine. We read of 200 Bishops, who mixt the Sacramental Wine with Ink, to signify the Condemnation of *Photius*; and can we suppose such a number of Prelates so profigate, as thus to prophane the real Blood of our Saviour? This exceeds all Probability. I might add the Custom in some places of Burning the remainder of the Elements after Communion: With their sending by Boys the Eucharist to imprison'd Confessors, &c. but I hasten to the positive Authorities of the Primitive Fathers.

I begin with the Apostolical Constitutions, because 'tis not improbable that some of them were compil'd in the most early times. There we find in many places the consecrated Elements call'd *the Representative Mysteries of the Body and Blood of our Saviour*. Representation and Reality are directly opposite, and consequently carnal Presence was then unknown.

In the same Age *St. Ignatius, M. and Bp of Antioch*, writes thus*. *There is one Flesh of our Lord, and one Blood shed for us. One Bread broken for all; and one Cup distributed to all*

*Nicetas in Vita
Ignatii Patri-
archæ Constant.
Tom. 8. Concil.
Labbei.*

*Hesychius in
Leviticum.*

*Const. Clem.
lib. 5. sect. 45.*

*Esteem'd as
genuine by some,
however very
ancient.*

* Μία ὅς ἐστιν ἡ σὰρξ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τὸ αἷμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐκχυθέν· εἷς καὶ ὁ αἶμας τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θιγμένου, καὶ ἐν ποσείον τοῦ σώματος διανεμηθέν. Epist. Interpol. ad Philadelph. p. 176. Edit. Vossii.

He

He calls the Eucharist *Bread*, and assures us that 'tis *broken*, which cannot agree with the Popish Notions.

Justin Martyr, in the next Century, has Words to the same Effect.

Οἱ καλέμενοι παρ' ἡμῶν ἀκούοντες διδόναι ἐκάστω τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβῆναι τὸ εὐχαριστήριον ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος, &c. Our Deacons give to every Person present part of the sanctified Bread, and Wine, and Water; and that Food we call the Eucharist, for we do not receive it as common Bread and Wine.

He affirms it to be still *Bread*, tho' not ordinary *Bread*, and when immediately after he says, that *this Bread is the Body of Christ*; 'tis plain that he means in a Symbolical or Mystical Sense, for he adds, τροφήν ἐξ ἧς σῶμα καὶ σάρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν. Meat which by digestion nourishes our Blood and Flesh. The property of Nourishing is manifestly inconsistent with an immortal and glorified Body.

St. Irenæus, who was almost *St. Justin's* Cotemporary, agrees with him in Doctrine and Expression. *We are fed*, says he, *by the Creature, but he himself gives it. He ordain'd that Cup which is a Creature, and his Blood also. And that Bread which is a Creature, and likewise his Body. So when the Bread and Cup are blessed by the Word of GOD, they become the Eucharist of the Body and Blood of Christ, and from them our Bodies receive Nourishment and Increase.*

In the beginning of the third Century, *Tertullian* appears, speaking distinctly like a Protestant, *Acceptum panem & distributum Discipulis Corpus suum illum fecit, dicendo, hoc*

Justin. Mart.

Apol. 2. ad Antoninum Pium.

Ibidem.

Irenæus advers. Heres. lib. 5. c. 12. Vide etiam lib. 4. c. 34.

Tertull. lib. 4. contr. Marcionem cap. 40.

Ibid.

est Corpus meum, id est, figura corporis mei
 The Bread which Christ took and distributed
 to his Disciples, he made his Body, saying, *This*
is my Body, that is, a figure of my Body. Then
 he proves the Reality of Christ's Body a-
 gainst the Marcionites, by asserting, that
 Bread was a real Figure. For, says he, it could
 not be a Figure unless Christ's Body were real
 for an airy Phantom is incapable of an Image
 or Figure. *Figura autem non fuisset, nisi ve-*
ritatis esset corpus: ceterum res vacua quod est
phantasma, figuram capere non posset.

Origen. Dial. 3.
 de Hom. Christo
 contra Marcion.

Both the Expression and Reason suit with
 Origen's Words against the same Hereticks.
 If Christ, as these Men, the Marcionites, er-
 roneously maintain, had neither Flesh nor Blood,
 Of what Body and Blood did He give the Signs
 and Images when he gave the Bread and Wine?
 The same Author, elsewhere, affords a most
 cogent Argument. *Quod si quod ingreditur in*
Os in Ventriculum abit, etiam ille cibus qui
Sanctificatur per Verbum Dei perque obsecra-
tionem, juxta id quod habet materiale in ven-
tre abibit & in secessum emittitur. Now if
 that which enters in at the Mouth passes into
 the Stomach, then even that Food which is
 sanctified by the Word of GOD and Prayers,
 as to the material part of it, passes into the
 Belly and is cast into the draught.

Idem. in cap.
 13 Matth.

Cyprian. lib. de
 Unit. Chrism.

St. Cyprian, or at least an Author of great An-
 tiquity, is conformable to Tertullian in his Do-
 ct. Trin. Christ, says he, when he made his last Feast
 with his Apostles, gave with his own Hands
 Bread and Wine to his Disciples: but his Body
 he gave into the Soldiers Hands to be Crucified.
 That the pure Truth being deeply imprinted in
 the

the Apostles Minds, they might expound to the Gentiles, how the Bread and Wine were his Flesh and Blood; how the Causes suit with the Effects, how different Names or Kinds are reduced to one Essence, and the signs and the things signified, are call'd by the same Name. This is consonant to what he says in one of his Epistles. *Dominus corpus suum panem vocat, de multorum granorum adunatione con-* Id. Epist. 76.
ad Magnum.
gestum. Our Lord calls Bread, made of many Corns, his Body.

We must not forget the Great Athanasius, (in the 4th Cent.) whose Authority is decisive in this Matter. Our Lord, says he, Athanas. in
illud Evangel.
Quicumque
dixerit verbum,
&c.
made a difference between the Flesh and Spirit, that we might understand his Words were not Carnal, but Spiritual; for how many Men could his Body have fed, that the whole World should be nourish'd by it? But therefore he mention'd his Ascension into heaven, that they might not take his Words in a corporal Sense; but might understand that his Flesh, whereof he spoke, is a Spiritual and Heavenly Food, given by himself from on high, for the Words that I spoke to you are Spirit and Life; as if He should say, My Body which is shewn and given for the World, shall be given in Food, that it may be distributed spiritually to every one, and preserve them all to the Resurrection to Eternal Life.

To him let us add Eusebius, who writes, Demonstrat.
Evangelic. lib.
2. c. 8. vide &
lib. 8.
that we are instructed to celebrate at the Holy Table, according to the Laws of the New Testament, the memory of this Sacrifice, by the signs of his Body and Blood.

The Author of the Imperfect Work on St. Matthew, speaks the same Language. If

Inter Opera
Chryſtomil. 11.
by many judg'd
to be St. Chryſ.

it be dangerous to apply the ſanctified Veſſels (of the Altar) to prophane uſes, in which there is not the true Body of Chriſt, but the Myſtery of his Body there contain'd. How much more dangerous is it to pollute the Veſſels of our own Bodies?

Chryſoſt. Epist.
ad Caſarium.
Tom. 8. Bibl. SS.
PP. Colon. an.
1618.

St. Chryſoſtom, who flouriſh'd at the ſame time, is clearly on our ſide. *Before the Bread is ſanctified we call it Bread, but when 'tis Conſecrated by the Divine Grace, through the Miniſtry of the Prieſt, 'tis eſteem'd worthy of the Name of our Lord's Body, tho' the Nature of Bread ſtill remain in it.* I will not deny, but that this eloquent Father, in ſome warm high Flights of Oratory, has dropt ſome unwary Expreſſions, which look towards a carnal Preſence, and may eaſily ſeduce unguarded Readers; but they are evidently Hyperbolical, nor do our Adverſaries dare take them in a ſtrict literal Senſe: And we meet with Sentences in the ſame Author concerning Baptiſm, equally emphatical and amplifying. Yet ſurely neither St. Chryſoſtom, nor any Man elſe, ever fancied a corporal Preſence, or *Transubſtantiation* in that Sacrament.

Cuncil. Car-
thag. can. 4.
anno. 397.

The Council of Carthage, held in the ſame Century, deſerves alſo our Conſideration. There we find it decreed, that in celebrating the Sacrament, nothing elſe ſhould be offer'd but the Body and Blood of our Lord, (as our Lord ordain'd) that is, Bread and Wine mixt with Water. And 'tis worth our Obſervation, that this very Canon was afterwards adopted and confirm'd by above 200 Biſhops in a Synod at *Conſtantinople*; on which Bal-
ſamon,

ſamon, t
The thir
defines,
of Brea
cauſe th
Body, an
I com
Authori
our Ad
This F
Body ca
gives t
not ſom
they ar
Sacram
Body is
Sacram
Father
as a Sa
of Chri
Faith
the B
Baptiſ
preſen
Eucha
than
is tha
made
be gar
minu
daret
Place
Chriſ
of M
ſpeak
ſaid

A Recantation-Sermon.

29

Samon, the Greek Canonist, thus remarks.

The thirty second Canon of the Trullan Synod defines, that the unbloody Sacrifice must consist of Bread and Wine, mixt with Water: Because the Bread is the Figure of the Lord's Body, and Wine the Figure of his Blood.

Constantinop.
In the Emperors
Palace, Anno.
691.

I come now to the great St. Austin, whose Authority is beyond all Exception, (with our Adversaries) and admits of no Evasion. This Father, having said, that almost every Body calls the Sacrament the Body of Christ, gives this Reason for it. *If Sacraments had not some resemblance with those things whereof they are Sacraments, they would not be true Sacraments.*

Aug. Serm.
de Verb. Apost.

Now as the Sacrament of Christ's Body is in some manner the Body of Christ, so the Sacrament of Faith [Baptism] is Faith. This Father makes a Parallel between Baptism,

Ep. 23. ad Bonifac. Edit.
Lovan.

as a Sacrament of Faith, and the Sacrament of Christ's Body: Telling us, that Baptism is Faith in the same Sense that the Eucharist is the Body of Christ. Now 'tis plain, that Baptism is not really Faith, but only in a representative Sense, nor consequently can the Eucharist be the Body of Christ, otherwise than in a mystical meaning. Equally clear,

is that other noted Passage of his, *Our Lord made no difficulty to say, this is my Body, when he gave the sign of his Body. Non dubitavit Dominus dicere hoc est corpus meum, cum signum daret Corporis sui.*

Contra Adimant. cap. 12.

I pass by that famous Place, where explaining those words of Jesus Christ, unless you eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, &c. he brings in our Saviour thus speaking, *Understand spiritually what I have said to you. You are not to eat this Body*
which

In Psalm 98. *which you see, and drink that Blood which my Crucifiers will shed. I have recommended a Sacrament to you, which being spiritually understood will give you life.* Nor shall I make any reflection on that celebrated Rule of interpreting Scripture, laid down in his Third Book of Christian Doctrine, where for an in-

Aug. lib. 3. de
Doct. Christi-
ana. cap. 7.

stance of a figurative Expression he brings the words just now cited: But shall produce a most remarkable place out of one of his Epistles, hitherto unobserv'd. There we find, that *Consentius*, a Bishop, had propos'd to *St. Austin*, *Whether Christ's Body, now in Heaven, consist of Flesh, Bones and Blood.* To which he answers, that we have no reason to doubt of Christ's having a real Body, but as for Blood, that we should not concern ourselves about an idle curiosity, or so much as enquire, whether he has now any Blood, or no.

Aug. Ep. 146.
ad Consent. E-
pisc. in Edit.
Lovanienfi.

Fides adsit & nulla questio remanebit, nisi forte de sanguine requirendum est, quia cum dixisset palpare & videte quia Spiritus carnem & ossa non habet, non addidit sanguinem, nec nos addamus inquirere quod ille non addidit dicere. Now had *St. Austin* believ'd, that the Wine in the Sacrament is substantially changed into our Saviour's Blood; or, that his Blood is substantially present in the Chalice, how is it possible, that he should question, whether Christ has now any Blood or not? How could a Person of his Penetration wave an Answer to the most easy Question imaginable? How ridiculous had it been, supposing the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* then known, for a Bishop to propose, as a serious and very difficult Question, what every Child could an-

swer.

swer. I am confident that no Man of Sense in the Roman Church, but would look upon such a Question now a-days to be almost as trifling as, *Who was the Father of the Sons of Zebedee?*

I should have mention'd St. *Ambrose* before, who in express terms declares, that the Eucharist is the figure of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. Lib. 4. de Sacrament. 5^o.
or a Cotemp. Author.

But none more fully and clearly express the Doctrin of the Reform'd, than the famous *Theodoret*. Our Lord says he, *Honour'd the visible signs, with the Name of his Body and Blood; not changing the Nature, but adding Grace to Nature.* ἡ τὴν φύσιν μεταβάλλον, ἀλλὰ χάριν τὴν φύσιν προσθεσκώς. And yet more distinctly in another place: *The divine Mysteries are the signs of his true Body*, then bringing in an *Eutychian* arguing, that as in the Holy Eucharist the Symbols are Transubstantiated, so Christ's human Nature was after his Resurrection and Ascension absorb'd, blended and changed into the Divinity; He turns the Argument thus upon his Antagonist: *You are caught in your own net: For the Mystical Signs do not depart from their own proper Nature, for they remain in their former substance, figure and form, and are visible and palpable as they were before Consecration.* The Romanists may shuffle as long as they please with these words, but 'tis impossible to evade the force of this Testimony. They may say with *Bellarmin*, that by *ὑπόστασις* he means the Nature or Essence of the Accidents, but *Theodoret* will tell us, that *ὑπόστασις* and *συνεσθηνός* are essentially different. *Corpus*, says he elsewhere, *est ὑπόστασις, morbus & sanitas, συνεσθηνός.* Besides

Theodoret. Dial. Immutabilis.

Id. Dialogo cui titulus, Inconfusus.

Lib. 2. de Euch. cap. 27.

abun-

Lib. 2. Dialog.
cap. 22. —
& c. 21. 24.
& 31.

Gelas. lib. de
duabus Christi
Naturis, cont.
Eutych.
Facund. in de-
fens. 3. Capit.
p. 404. Isid. de
Offic. Eccles. cap.
18, &c.

Ephrem. apud
Phot. in Bibl.
Bed. Serm. de
Epiphania.

The Saxon Ho-
mily, publicly
read in Church-
es, anno 990.

In MM. in
Cambridge Li-
brary.

abundance of other places, where he always
uses ~~is~~ for Substance: Nor did any of the An-
cients ever think of any distinction in Entity,
or Separability of Accidents from Substance.
This is modern Philosophy, invented and
coin'd on purpose to support a tottering Cause.

The Authority of Pope *Gelasius*, who liv'd
in the same Age, of *Facundus* Bishop of *Her-*
miana, *Isidore* of *Sevil*, *Ephrem* Patriarch of
Constantinople, is no less clear and convinc-
ing, which for brevity I must here omit.
With the Testimony of Ven. *Bede*, *Jo. Erigena*,
Strabo, *Fulbert*, *Amalarius*, *Bertram*, *Rabanus*,
Maurus, and several others, down to the
Eleventh Age.

What was the Doctrine of our English
Church in the Tenth Century, we may
learn from *Elfric*, Arch-Bishop of *Canter-*
bury, who thus writes: *There's a great differ-*
rence betwixt that Body wherein Christ suffer'd
and that wherein the Host is consecrated
That Body wherein Christ suffer'd, was born of
the Virgin Mary, consisting of Blood and Bones,
Skin and Nerves, human Members and a rational
Soul: But his spiritual Body, which we call the
Host, is made of many united grains of Corn,
and has neither Blood, nor Bones, neither Mem-
bers, nor Soul. — The Body of Christ, which
once died and rose again, shall die no more, but
remains eternal and impassible: But this Host
is temporal and corruptible, divided into parts
broken with the teeth, and swallow'd down into
the stomach. Lastly, This Mystery is a Pledge
and a Figure: The Body of Christ is that
very truth. What is seen is Bread; but what
is spiritually understood is Life.

Le

Let us now sum up the Evidence in a few words, and leave all impartial and unbiass'd persons to judge, whether it appear probable, or even possible, that such a number of pious, learned and judicious Writers, (many of them dogmatically treating of this Subject) should for *so many Ages, so clearly, constantly, and uniformly, write, argue, explain and conclude*, as we find they have done, if they had really believ'd the Popish *Transubstantiation*. They assert, that the Eucharist is *Bread*, and that the Elements nourish our Bodies, as the Grace refreshes our Souls. The *Romanists* affirm, that 'tis not *Bread*, but the very impassible and immortal Body of Jesus Christ. The Fathers maintain, that the Sacrament is a *Type, Figure, Symbol*, mystically exhibiting the sacred Body of Christ: Our Adversaries profess the Contrary; believing it the natural Body, carnally given and receiv'd. The Fathers declare, that the *nature and substance* of Bread and Wine remain unchang'd. The *Roman* Divines define, that they are reduced to nothing. Those never mention the duty of supream Adoration to the Eucharist: These Command, and Practice, Kneeling, Prostration, and all Sovereign Honour. The Fathers were strangers to hovering Accidents and airy Species. Our Enemies System is totally supported by them. Those Writers generally express themselves in words and manner, obvious to the meanest Capacities. These Gentlemen raise Mists and spread Darkness round a new-forg'd Mystery, and guard it with Legions of unintelligible Terms, and metaphysical Jargon. In fine, the Fathers speak like Orthodox Protestants

E

stants now living; and if the Romanists will have us believe, that the Fathers *held, believ'd, taught and explain'd* their Popish Doctrine, they must first persuade us, that when they said *White*, they in reality meant *Black*.

Wherefore we may justly conclude, that *Transubstantiation* was no part of the primitive Doctrine, but *privately brought in*. When

Matth. 13. 24.

Men sowed the tares were sown, and grew up in times of Darkness, Ignorance, Negligence and Credulity: Occasion'd by a few equivocal Sayings, and some extravagant Flourishes of Rhetorick, it was first maintain'd by leading Men of warm Imaginations, fiery Zeal, little Learning, and weak Judgment, and perhaps improv'd by Men of dark and deep Design, and no Religion: While none of them understood what they said or fancied they believ'd. Which may be the reason why 'twas so long before it was brought into any tolerable shape. (If even now it have any form at all)

This seems not improbable from that famous *Test*, offer'd to *Berengarius*, by Pope *Nicholas*, and his wise Council of above an Hundred Prelates, which, to the eternal Disgrace of those Times, stands still upon Record, in the Popish Canon-Law, and is as follows. *I Berengarius profess, -- That the Bread and Wine*

Concil. Rom.
sub Nicolao.
2. an. 1060.

Distinc. 2. de
Consecrat. Can.
Ego Berengarius.

See the Gloss on
that Canon.

placed on the Altar, are, after Consecration, not only the Sacrament, but also the true Body and Blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and that the Body of Jesus Christ, is not only in Sign or Sacrament, but in reality handled and broken by the Hands of the Priest, and sensibly chew'd by the teeth of the Faithful. This monstrous Formulary evinces, that they who fram'd and propos'd it, did not understand what

what

what they said, (and, is no small Argument, that *Transubstantiation* had never been taught before) for it not only contains manifest Impiety, but besides, is the most absurd piece of Non-sense that ever was Penn'd. Thus I presume I have proved this Doctrine repugnant to Scripture and Antiquity. Let us now briefly infer, that it is in it self Damnable, and so conclude.

That *Heresy* is a Sin of its own Nature Damnable, is too evident to need any labour'd Proof. The very Notion imports, *an obstinate, perverse defence of a Doctrine contrary to a Reveald Truth*: And 'tis enough for my purpose, that the Apostle ranks it among those *works of the Flesh, which exclude from the Kingdom of Heaven*. But this Heretical Doctrine of the *Roman Church*, is attended with a peculiar Malignity, which renders the Error insupportable, pernicious, and deservedly abhorr'd by all Orthodox Christians. Had this Church barely maintain'd with some *Lutherans*, that Christ's Sacred Body is really existent with the Elements, without obliging People to believe it; such a Notion, how absurd and ungrounded soever it be, yet not influencing Practice, nor perverting the Christian Worship, might deserve Pity for their Ignorance, and a kind of Toleration. But there is a wide difference between this idle Fancy, and the *Roman Heresy*: Nor can all the Disguise, Paint and Artifice of the Bishop of *Meaux*, make them alike. The Popish *Transubstantiation*, besides the Absurdity of a Carnal Presence, makes Almighty GOD offer a perpetual Illusion to the Senses of all Mankind: Annihilates

Galat. V. 20.

Exposition de la Foy Catholique, chap. de la presence réelle, p. 161.

A Recantation-Sermon.

the Sacrament, by destroying the Signs ; induces a proper Sacrifice , contrary to St. *Paul*, and compels its Professors to pay the same Adoration to a meer Creature, which only belongs to the Creator. 'Tis this Sacrilegious Injunction which gives their Doctrine a deep tincture of Idolatry, which can never be wash'd out. I am not ignorant, that a few Writers of our own Church, have strain'd their Charity, and extended their Moderation so far, as almost to acquit the *Romanists* of Idolatry in this matter: But that mistaken Charity, which put upon their Judgments, is neither authoriz'd nor countenanced by our Church. The Reason is clear. The *Romanists* Prostrate, Invoke, offer Incense, pay all imaginable Homage, internal and external Adoration, to that which in reality is bare Bread and Wine, [as to any physical Excellency] to meer Creatures, and in them the highest Veneration terminates. In vain do they alledge, that they are fully persuaded that Jesus Christ, who is God, is there Personally present, and to Him alone they direct their Adorations, for no pious Intention whatsoever can rectify the Obliquity of a Criminal Action. After this rate, many *Pagans*, who worship'd the Sun for a God, might make the same Plea ; and the *Israelites*, who adored the *Golden Calf* as an Emblem of the Deity, might also find a justifiable Excuse. For we can't conceive, that the Priests and others among them, were so senselessly stupid as to believe, that the very Statue which they themselves just then made, was that Almighty Creator who made the World, and who brought them out of *Egypt*,
but

but regarded this *Calf* as a Symbol and Emblem of that great G O D, who had done such Mighty Wonders in favour of them: And yet GOD's Indignation almost consum'd them, with all their pious Intentions.

To press the Argument more close; the *Romanist's* Intention is to Adore the Sacrament, to Worship that which the Priest holds in his Hands, which he elevates immediately after the Consecration. This we have prov'd to be a meer Creature, wherein G O D is no more particularly or personally present, than in the Planets, and so not *there* the Object of Adoration, consequently that Sovereign Worship *there* given to the Sacrament, terminates in a Creature, which is the very Notion of Idolatry in a strict Sense.

'Tis true, there is an eminent Divine, of *Vasquez. in 3.* that Communion who magisterially decides, *D. CX. q. 25. &* that a *Christian may worship G O D in any alibi.* Creature, in a Crucifix, tho' a Demon lay conceal'd under it; prostrate himself before a Stone, or the Sun-beams, provided the Intention be directed to G O D; [*Sicut ergo Homo per Lapidem aut in Lapide, potest Deum hâc sincerâ fide colere, &c.*] But I leave all sober Christians to judge, where such Divinity as this was hatcht. According to this glorious Discovery, Christians may take the Statue of *Jupiter*, carry it in Solemn Pomp and Procession, place it on the Altar, offer Incense before it, fall down and worship, very *Innocently, Religiously, and Meritoriously*, provided they only take care to take good Aim, and level the Intention aright. A noble Secret, and worthy its Inventor, a *Jesuite!*

More rationally does one of his Society argue,

*Coster in En-
chirid. de Sa-
crament. cap. 8.
par. 10.*

argue, when he asserts, *That if Christ be not in this Sacrament, but only Bread, more tolerable is their Error, who worship a Golden Statue for a God, or an Image of any other Matter, as the Gentiles did their Deities; or a Scarlet Cloth hung upon a Lance, as is reported of the Lapponians, or living Creatures, as the Ancient Egyptians did, than their Error who adore a piece of Bread.*

*Catharin. An-
notat. ad vers.
dogm. Cajetani,
p. 134.*

Equally ingenuous and more full is the Learned Catharinus's Confession, in these Words. *In the consecrated Host Christ is adored as God, not absolutely, but as existing under these Forms (of Bread and Wine). Wherefore whenever Christ is not there, but a meer Creature, instead of Christ, to whom the Adoration is directed, 'tis Idolatry. On this very Account, they were Idolaters who adored the Heavens, or any thing else, fancying that they there adored GOD, whom they call'd the Soul of the World, according to Varro's Theology. Wherefore they are not excus'd from Idolatry, for thinking they worship'd one God, (as in reality there was one God) but are guilty of it in adoring him there, where he was not, in such a manner as they apprehended.*

*R. H. Author
of the Guide in
Controversy.*

Neither is this their private Sentiment, but the general Opinion of the Roman Divines, who suppose, that such as Adore the Sacrament would commit Idolatry, if Christ were not there Personally present. (Hence their distinction of *Material* and *Formal* Idolatry, unknown to all the Primitive Fathers) And an eminent Writer of our own Nation, and an Apostate from our Church, brings this Argument to prove that the Roman Church does not Err in the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, that otherwise she would be guilty

guilty of gross Idolatry, and so cease to be a true Church. Since this Gentleman draws a Consequence so extensive, he must give us leave to infer at least thus much, that she stands Convicted of having brought in a damnable Heresy. In what sense this Church, so corrupt and degenerate, may still be call'd a True Church; and how far Errors in their own Nature Damnable, may yet in some Persons be consistent with Salvation, I shall not here examin, as not belonging to my present Subject.

From what has been said, let us all take occasion to Laud and Magnify, with the deepest sense of Gratitude, the immense Goodness of Almighty G O D, who has been pleas'd to expel out of this our Island, that, What shall I call it? Antichristian Spirit of Rome, which had so long posselt and deluded the Nation, and, by a peaceable, regular and general Reformation, has restor'd Religion to its primitive Beauty and Lustre. Particularly, let us never forget that signal Instance of his Providence, in dispersing those Black Clouds, and diverting that Dreadful Storm, which within our Memory hung over our Heads; threatening, not only the Destruction of our Laws, Liberty, and Property, but a total Extirpation, or Suppression, of what should be most dear to us, our Holy Religion, as by Law Establish'd. Let us study to adorn the Temple of God, now intirely clear'd of the Rubbish and Filth of Popery, and zealously keep out whatever has a real Tendency towards it.

And I, for my part, most gladly imbrace this happy Occasion of returning publick Thanks
to

A Recantation-Sermon.

to Almighty G O D, for His Gracious Favour, in bringing me back to my Mother Church. Whose Wholesome Doctrin may vie with that of the purest Times; whose Holy Discipline is most Apostolical: Whose Excellent Liturgy, and Solemn, Grave and Decent Worship, equally distant from the pompous Pageantry of *Rome*, and the nauseous Cant, and unmannerly Service of the Dissenters, justly render Her *the Honour, the Glory, and the Support of the Reformation*. And I hope I shall never forget that Admonition of the Apostle: *Ye were sometime Darkness, but now Light in the Lord, walk as Children of Light*. Which God of his infinite Mercy grant we may all do.

The Form of Renunciation Drawn up and Read by the Preacher.

I William Aylmer do here in the presence of God and this Congregation, most Heartily, Seriously and Sincerely, Condemn, Reject, Renounce and Abjure, all and singular Heresies, Errors and Superstitious Doctrines and Practices, peculiar to the *Roman Church*: particularly that Doctrin which says, That the Elements of Bread and Wine are substantially destroy'd, and by Consecration chang'd into the Real Body and Blood of our Lord and Saviour *Jesus Christ*, with the Doctrin of the Supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, Veneration of Images, and all other the Doctrines contain'd in the New Creed of Pope *Pius IV.* which are contrary to the Holy Scriptures, and the Faith of the Establish'd Church of *England*. And this I do without any mental Restriction, Reservation, or Evasion whatsoever: Resolving to Live and Dye in the Belief and Communion of the said Establish'd Church of *England*.

So help me God.

F I N I S.